UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/892,732	06/28/2001	Noboru Iwayama	1405.1045	3572

21171   7590   07/11/2008
STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
LE, KHANH H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3688	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/11/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/892,732	IWAYAMA ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	KHANH H. LE	3688	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02/21/2008</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-12,14 and 15</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-12,14 and 15</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is responsive to the Response filed 02/21/08. Claims 1-12, 14-15
remain pending. Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 11,12, 14-15 are amended. Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14-15
are independent.

Specification

2.   Upon reconsideration, the requirement for a substitute specification is hereby withdrawn.

Claim objections

3.   Claim 1, 3rd to last line: "first advertising information broadcast" should be changed to
"first advertising information" for proper antecedent basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4.   Previous rejections to claims 1-9, 11-12, 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph,
are withdrawn following corrections and further consideration.

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not effective in
overcoming the prior art.

        Applicant's arguments and the new limitations or amended claims are addressed in the
prior art discussion below.

        It is also noted that, in order to expedite prosecution, in preparing their next Response,
though Chung is not herein applied to claims 1-10, and 14-15, Applicants should consider
Chung, as potentially applicable to these claims as claim 1 closely parallels claim 12 to which
Chung is applied.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found
in a prior Office action.

7.   **Claims 1-4, 9, 10, 12, 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**
unpatentable over Recommend-it.com, a set of 3 documents, which date back to 1998, as
described further below, in view of Porat et al, US 20020026353 A1.

7a.   "Want to See What We Can Do For Your Website?
Click The Button To Test Us Out! " at Recommend-it.com , http://
web.archive.org/web/19980610011830/www.recommend-it.com/, (4 pages, dated back to
1998), herein "Recommend-it document #1", discloses a system where a website (such as
www.webdeck.com) browsed by a 1st user (e.g." Eileen Velet") is detected and an email,
disclosing the status of the 1st user ("velvet wants to you to check this site out") is sent to
buddies of the 1st user indicating the website just visited by this user (see page 2 , left frame
lines 5-7) ,and links to that website so the buddy can visit (see page 4, line 8) . Included in the
email is description of the site and other "juicy details" of the site so that the "friend or colleague
will see exactly what the site contains before they visit" (see page 4 of 4). The description of the
site and the "juicy details" of the site constitute an advertisement for the site to entice the buddy
to visit.

        Recommend-it #1 further adds more ads in the invitation message (see at page 4,
the financial ad "Green Mountain Asset" tagged to the email message).

         Recommend it, http:// web.archive.org/web/19980610011837/www.recommend-
it.com/user_reg.user_regHTML.fcgi, herein" Recommend-it document #2",   (2 pages)
shows setting up buddy lists to send recommended site identifiers to.

"**Advertising rates**" **at Recommend-it.com, http://**
web.archive.org/web/19980610011859/www.recommend-it.com/html/advert.html, herein"
Recommend-it document #3", (**2pages**) discloses solicitation of advertisers and advertising
pay rates.

7b.   <u>**Thus as to independent claims 1, 10, 12, 14-15**</u>**, Recommend-it discloses:**

An advertising method, system, computer program for broadcasting advertisements to
user operated, network-interconnected computers including a first computer operated by a first
user and a second computer operated by a second user, the method including:

a) administrating status of users including the first user (e.g." Eileen Velet") and the
second user (her friend) . (Recommend-it reads on friends of Eileen Velet signing up to the same
service as well. The buddy list may be reciprocal lists i.e. Eileen Velet lists her friend as buddy
and vice versa).

b) receiving from the first computer and broadcasting to the second computer the status
of the first user ("Velet wants to you to check this site out" means Eileen velvet has been
monitored as having visited that site);

c) correlatively recording in an advertising database (implicit) resource identification
information specifying a resource on the network (URL of the game website visited by Eileen
Velet") with a plurality of advertising information (the game site description, the plural pieces
of data that constitute "the juicy details" of the game site, also the tagged on other promotion :
see at page 4, the financial ad "Green Mountain Asset" tagged to the email message).
for the advertisements;

d) receiving from at least a third (advertiser) computer
the resource identification information (RECOMMEND-IT #1 line 2: " register your site
now!"), at least two items of a plurality of advertising information (e.g. information about the
site, other associated ads) or a combination thereof, recorded in said recording

e) detecting resource identification information for a first resource in use by the first user;

f) e x t r a c t i n g first advertising information (e.g. details of the game) corresponding
to the resource identification information (URL of the game site) , and recorded in said
recording, for the first resource detected in said detection, wherein the extracted first advertising
information is chosen from the recorded plurality of advertising information (e.g. details of the
game, other ads such as "Green Mountain Asset") correlated to (implicit) the resource
identification information;

g) broadcasting to the second computer said first advertising information extracted in said
extraction; and

h) displaying (in the email) status of the first user on the second computer, said status
represented by advertising data (description of the game site in the email shows the status of the
1st user as being at that site previously) included in said first advertising information broadcast,
said displaying occurring in response to browsing by said first computer.

**Recommend-it does not disclose the broadcasting to the second computer being
performed in response to a request by the second user (or a second user computer) for the
status of the first user.**

**However, because people like to hear from friends, and value their
recommendations, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art
at the time the invention was made (herein "PHOSITA") that the second user would ask a**

friend (the first user) computer to send recommendations by adding him or her (second
user) to the first user's buddy list for recommendations.

This request even if made in person to the first user would read on "a request by
the second user for the status of the first user" and clearly the broadcasting to the second
computer would have been performed in response thereto (claims 1, 10, 15).

It would also have been obvious to a PHOSITA that the second user could make the
request from his or her computer to the first user (e.g. via email or instant message)
because such means of communication are convenient and widely used. In this case, the
broadcasting to the second computer would have being performed in response to a request
by the second user computer for the status of the first user (claims 12 and 14).

Recommend-it does not disclose the ads are represented by "a plurality of image
data ", however Porat et al. discloses email to buddies recommending a particular page and its
URL visited by a shopper can include an image of the item or product viewed by the 1st user
(paragraph [0049], see also Figure 7 "tell a friend" button, paragraphs [0048]-[0050]).

Since "a picture is worth a thousand words" it would have been desirable and thus
obvious to a PHOSITA to add Porat's image teaching to the Recommend-it message to describe
more efficiently or succinctly the web site (e.g. game site) recommended. It would also have
been obvious to use the same picture or icon representation technique to efficiently represent
additional ads such as the "Green Mountain Asset" ad tagged to the message.

Thus RECOMMEND-IT/Porat discloses "a plurality of image data "and the status of the
1st user being represented as image data, as claimed.

Response to arguments:

Claim 1, as amended, recites further displaying the status of the first user on the second computer, said status represented by advertising image data included in one of the at least two items of first advertising information, and **displaying image data of the at least two items of first advertising information in a separate area, said displaying occurring in response to browsing by said first computer.**

This is interpreted, as submitted by Applicant, to mean **"one of the items of advertising information is displayed as status information of a user, and that item of advertising information is also displayed along with another one or more items of advertising information in another display area."**

Applicant argues that Recommend merely transmits a website that a user is viewing to another user, the first user having specified it as recommendation information. It is believed the argument is that the website information itself is notified to the second user in contrast to the present invention which is about displaying a plurality of advertisements to the second user, " both an advertisement for something like a store, and an advertisement for a recommended product from that or other stores."

The Examiner notes that Recommend it discloses exactly " both an advertisement for something like a store" (the recommended website), "and an advertisement for a recommended product from that or other stores" (details of the recommended game site or other ads such as "Green Mountain Asset).

Porat is next used to show that representing ad items in graphical form or images was known. As stated earlier and above, *"[S]ince "a picture is worth a thousand words" it would have been desirable and thus obvious to a PHOSITA to add Porat's image teaching to the Recommend-it message to* **describe more efficiently or succinctly the web site (e.g. game site) recommended. It would also have been** _obvious_ **to use the same picture or icon representation**

technique to efficiently represent additional ads such as the "Green Mountain Asset" ad

tagged to the message. Thus RECOMMEND-IT/Porat discloses "a plurality of image data

"and the status of the 1ˢᵗ user being represented as image data, as claimed."

Applicant further argues *"[I]f the user of such an embodiment views the advertisement*
and is interested in the displayed product, she can directly access the product information by
clicking the image data of the product. If she wishes to view other products, she can view the
other products by clicking the image data of the store and accessing same."

As shown above, the combination of Recommend-it and Porat allows exactly that.

Applicant further argues the Examiner is wrong in equating adding a second user to a
buddy list of a first user to the recited feature of broadcasting being performed in response to a
status request by the second user.

However Applicant cannot point to any <u>specific definition</u> of the recited feature.
Applicant further argued "there is no requisite motivation for any such modification", however
this is not a motivation issue, only an interpretation issue.

Unless a term is given a "clear definition" in the specification (MPEP § 2111.01), the
examiner is obligated to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation, in light of the
specification, and consistent with the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach
(MPEP § 2111). An inventor may define specific terms used to describe invention, but must do
so '~with reasonable clarity, deliberateness, and precision" (MPEP § 21] !-0].III). A "clear
definition" must establish the metes and bounds of the terms. A clear definition must
unambiguously establish what is and what is not included. A clear definition is indicated by a
section labeled definitions, or by the use of phrases such as "by xxx we mean"; "xxx is defined
as"; or "xxx includes, ... but does not include ... ".

The instant application contains no such clear definition for the above discussed limitation. Thus, the examiner is required to give the term "broadcasting being performed in response to a status request by the second user" its broadest reasonable interpretation, which the examiner judges to be broadcasting a recommended site to a second user who has been added to a buddy list of a first user to receive recommendations.

The last newly cited feature is to display the ad images data in a separate area or separate from each other.

Both Recommend-it and Porat arguably display ads in separate areas. However, even if they do not so disclose, it would have been obvious to a PHOSITA to place the ad images, including the image representing 1st user status, on the webpage wherever and in whatever groupings needed to achieve the most or desired advertising impact, or best or desired design or aesthetic purpose. See also, *Examination Guidelines for Determining Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. 103 in View of the Supreme Court Decision in KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., Federal Register / Vol. 72, No. 195 / Wednesday, October 10,2007Notices,http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/com/sol/notices/72fr57526.pdf* (herein " KSR Guidelines"), e.g. Rationale F.

(Note as to claim 12)

Currently amended 12 recites:

A method for advertising, comprising: transmitting at least two items of advertisement information from a first computer to a second computer, in response to a third computer browsing web information and the second computer requesting the the-a browsing status of the third computer;

displaying the browsing status of the third computer on a display of the second computer, said status represented by image data included in one of the at least two items of advertisement !information; and

displaying image data of the at least two items of advertisement information in a separate area on the display of the second computer

wherein the <u>at least two items </u>of advertisement information are chosen from a plurality of advertisement information previously stored and correlated to the web information being browsed by the third computer.

Interpretation:
the 3rd computer in claim 12 is the equivalent of the computer of the first user in claim 1. The 1st computer in claim 12 is the equivalent of a system computer in claim 1 which facilitates transmission to second user computer upon browsing by 1st user computer.
Thus claim 12 is rejected on the same basis as claim 1.)

7c.   As to independent claims 2 and 9,

the limitations common to independent claims 1, 10, 12, 14-15 are disclosed as above discussed.

<u>RECOMMEND-IT does not specifically disclose </u>receiving new (unregistered) ads information from these advertisers and designations of already registered resources.

<u>However, Official Notice is taken</u> that accepting new (unregistered) information from clients and correlating new information with other client's data already belonging to the same clients is well-known in order to correlatively update the clients' existing data with new data.

(This Official Notice is taken as admitted since during prosecution, the challenge thereto was defective: Applicant did not timely point out with specificity the supposed errors i.e. <u>did not state why the Official Notice is not well-known. </u>MPEP 2144.03 C).

"To adequately traverse such a finding, an applicant must specifically point out the supposed errors in the examiner's action, which would include stating <u>why</u> the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art. See 37 CFR 1.111(b). See also Chevenard, 139 F.2d at 713, 60 USPQ at 241"....)

Thus it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to add these customary methods to the system of RECOMMEND-IT above to allow adding new advertising data (such as new details of the sites or new images/icons of ads] to the ad resources (e.g. the game URL's in RECOMMEND-IT), in the correlative database to allow updating the data associated with the sites (e.g. icons, further details of the shopping or game sites) for the consumers' benefit.

7d.   RECOMMEND-IT also disclose **(dependent claim 4)** at the citations above.

7e.   RECOMMEND-IT does not specifically disclose **(dependent claim 3)** communicating with clients using their addresses, to ask their permission to correlate the new information with certain existing data already registered as belonging to them, and with their permission, so perform the correlation, as claimed.   However Official Notice is taken that asking permission in such situations is customary to ensure correct correlation of data, secure client authorization and thus their satisfaction.

(As stated earlier, arguments against this Official Notice have been defective as lacking specificity as well, see above).

Thus it would have been obvious to a PHOSITA to add such customary methods to RECOMMEND-IT for the above-discussed advantage.

8.   Claims 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over RECOMMEND-IT/ Porat, and further in view of Goldhaber et al., US 5,794,210 and/or admitted art.

Dependent claims 5-8 (dependent on claims 4 and 6):

RECOMMEND-IT/ Porat discloses claims 4, and 6 above and further RECOMMEND-IT/ Porat discloses linking from the recommended site represented by an image to the site and Porat further discloses interacting at the site to request detailed information associated with the ad sent, and the system returning the detailed information (Fig. 6; [0045]; [0046]).

However, Recommend-it does not disclose the steps of monitoring access to the ads detailed information from the user, setting awards conditions set for the user based on access to ads, doling out awards as earned, monitoring access counts to detailed ads information, calculating fees to charge advertisers based on the user access.

However these steps are all disclosed either in **Goldhaber** (see at least abstract, Figs. 1-15 and associated text) or as admitted art in the Specifications (see at least pages 2-3).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to add the methods of ad viewing rewards and charging of advertisers taught Goldhaber or admitted, to the advertising system/method of Recommend-it to effect the ad compensation/ charge scheme as taught by Goldhaber or admittedly known, to further encourage ad viewing.

9.   **Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chung et al., US Application Publication 2006/0184886 and further in view of Goldhaber et al., US 5,794,210 and/or admitted art.**

Independent claim 11:

Chung discloses:

An advertising method using a status information administration system wherein a plurality of user terminals is interconnected via a network, information on user status sent from one of the plurality of user terminals is acquired and administrated for each user, look-up

requests for status information designating at least one user are received, and administrated user status information correlated with the users is sent to requestor user terminals

([0045]; [0046]:; [0192]; [0227] :a "status information administration system" is a system that continuously broadcasts status information regarding its users' presence such as browsing, see [0203]; [0204], [0227]: co-browsing).

the advertising method comprising:

detecting information identifying a network resource requested from one of the plurality of user terminals and correlatively recording the detected information with user information identifying a user using the user terminal ([0132][0133]: pages accessed by 1st user are identified), [0158]: tracking 1st user);

accepting a status information look-up request designating at least one user from one of a plurality of user terminals, the look-up request being sent from a user other than the designated at least one user (i.e. 2nd user) ([0227], [0157] - [0160]) (in order for the 2nd user to receive a status of the 1st user)

acquiring network resource identification information correlatively recorded with the user designated by the status information request ([0132]-[0133]: pages accessed by 1st user are identified),

acquiring and sending to the look-up requestor user (2nd user) terminal at least two items chosen from a plurality of advertising data correlatively stored for each network resource by advertisers ([0134]; [0135]; [0182]; [0203]; [0204], [0227]: **co-browsing by 2nd user--**when 1st user browses commercial sites, see [0048])-- means 2nd user is sent commercial pages which usually have plural advertising data thereon, or which can be "infinitely" linked for further information (see [0133], which reads on further ad details, implicitly sent to the system for recording and correlation by advertisers))

Thus Chung discloses displaying to 2nd user, data as indicating status of 1st user (webpage visited by 1st user) and also other ad data which read on the newly cited feature of "one of the items being designated to be displayed as the user status as well as being displayed with the remaining items"

Chung does not disclose the steps of monitoring access to the ads detailed information from the user, setting awards conditions set for the user based on access to ads, doling out awards as earned, monitoring access counts to detailed ads information, calculating fees to charge advertisers based on the user access.

However these steps are all disclosed either in **Goldhaber** (see at least abstract, Figs. 1-15 and associated text) or as admitted art in the Specifications (see at least pages 2-3) .

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to add the methods of ad viewing rewards and charging of advertisers taught Goldhaber or admitted, to the advertising system/method of Recommend-it to effect the ad compensation/ charge scheme as taught by Goldhaber or admittedly known, to further encourage ad viewing.

<div align="center">Alternate rejection of claim 13</div>

10.   **Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chung in view of Porat.**

Currently amended 12 recites:

A method for advertising, comprising: transmitting at least two items of advertisement information from a first computer to a second computer, in response to a third computer browsing web information and the second computer requesting the the-a browsing status of the third computer;

displaying the browsing status of the third computer on a display of the second computer, said
status represented by image data included in one of the at least two items of advertisement
!information; and
displaying image data of the at least two items of advertisement information in a separate area on
the display of the second computer
wherein the at least two items of advertisement information are chosen from a plurality of
advertisement information previously stored and correlated to the web information being
browsed by the third computer.

Interpretation:

the 3rd computer in claim 12 is the equivalent of the computer of the first user in claim
11. The 1st computer in claim 12 is the equivalent of a system computer in claim 11 which
facilitates transmission to second user computer upon browsing by 1st user computer.

**Thus the limitations of claim 12 common to claim 11 are rejected on the same basis
as in claim 11.**

Chung does not disclose the ads are represented by "a plurality of image data ",
however **Porat et al. discloses** email to buddies recommending a particular page and its URL
visited by a shopper can include an image of the item or product viewed by the 1st user
(paragraph [0049], see also Figure 7 "tell a friend" button, paragraphs [0048]-[0050]).

Since "a picture is worth a thousand words" it would have been desirable and thus
obvious to a PHOSITA to add Porat's image teaching to the Chung URL to describe more
efficiently or succinctly the web site recommended. It would also have been obvious to use the
same picture or icon representation technique to efficiently represent additional ads described by
Chung.

Thus Chung/Porat discloses "a plurality of image data "and the status of the 1st user being represented as image data, as claimed.

The last newly cited feature is to display the status image and ad images data in a separate area or separate from each other.

Both Chung and Porat arguably display ads in separate areas. However, even if they do not so disclose, it would have been obvious to a PHOSITA to place the ad images, including the image representing 1st user status, on the webpage wherever and in whatever groupings needed to achieve the most or desired advertising impact, or best or desired design or aesthetic purpose. See also KSR Guidelines, e.g. Rationale F.

Conclusion

11.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh H. Le whose telephone number is 571-272-6721. The Examiner works a part-time schedule and can normally be reached on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Friday 9:00-6:00.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, James W. Myhre can be reached on 571-272-6722. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are **571-273-8300** for regular communications and for After Final communications. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-3600. For patent related correspondence, hand carry deliveries must be made to the Customer Service Window (now located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314)..

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

July 6, 2008
/Khanh H. Le/
Examiner, Art Unit 3688

/James W Myhre/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3688